

On the meaning of entanglement in quantum measurement

Fedor Herbut

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Knez Mihajlova 35, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia*

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Measurement interaction between a measured object and a measuring instrument, if both are initially in a pure state, produces a (final) bipartite entangled state vector $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$. The quasi-classical part of the correlations in it is connected with transmission of information in the measurement. But, prior to "reading" the instrument, there is also purely quantum entanglement in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$. It is shown that in repeatable measurement quantitatively the entanglement equals the amount of incompatibility between the measured observable A_1 and $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$; and it also equals the amount of incompatibility of A_1 and the initial state of the object.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Mn

The meaning of entanglement in measurement is clarified under the following restrictions: (i) the initial state of the object is a state vector $|\psi\rangle$ (with or without index 1 depending on the context); (ii) the initial state of the measuring instrument (MI) is a state vector $|\phi\rangle_2^0$; (iii) the measurement is repeatable.

The restriction to $|\psi\rangle_1$ is primarily motivated by easy feasibility of finding an answer. Besides, it is natural to tackle the easier case of a pure state before tackling that of a mixed one. Confining oneself to $|\phi\rangle_2^0$ is often done. It is not very restrictive because, by so-called purification, one can, at least in principle, replace any initial mixed state ρ_2^0 of the MI by a (more composite) state vector $|\phi\rangle_{23}^0$ the reduced density operator of which equals the given mixed state:

$$\text{Tr}_3(|\phi\rangle_{23}^0 \langle\phi|_{23}^0) = \rho_2^0.$$

Finally, repeatable measurements have the physical advantage over the nonrepeatable ones that consists in the possibility to check the result obtained on an individual object. This makes them the more important ones. Needless to say that they contain as a special case the kind of measurement that is most used in the textbook and expert literature: ideal measurement.

It was shown in a recent article by Vedral [1] that *entanglement* does not take part in the transmission of information from object to MI. One wonders if it has anything to do with the measurement. In the present note Vedral's mentioned result is confirmed, and, more importantly, the connection of the entanglement with the measurement is clarified (at least for the mentioned restricted case).

Let ρ be an arbitrary quantum state (density operator) and

$$A = \sum_k a_k P_k + \sum_l a_l P_l \quad (1)$$

an arbitrary discrete observable (Hermitian operator) in spectral form (with distinct eigenvalues). The observ-

able need not be complete, i. e., the eigenvalues may be degenerate. The index k enumerates the detectable (positive probability) eigenvalues in ρ . As far as this state is concerned, A can be replaced by the first sum on the RHS of (1).

To define measurement of A in ρ , let an MI be given - we denote it as subsystem 2 - with an initial state vector $|\phi\rangle_2^0$ and a composite-system unitary measurement evolution operator U_{12} "containing" the suitable interaction with the measured object - now subsystem 1. The final bipartite state is

$$|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \equiv U_{12}(|\psi\rangle_1 \otimes |\phi\rangle_2^0) \quad (2)$$

Finally, let a so-called pointer observable $B_2 \equiv \sum_k b_k Q_2^k + \sum_l b_l Q_2^l$ be given (in a form analogous to that of A) with, possibly, degenerate b_k , and b_l being zero-probability in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$.

The standard *definition of measurement* of A in ρ requires that the so-called *probability reproducibility condition* (PRC) be valid [2]. It states that the predicted probabilities p_k are reproduced in the results read on the MI:

$$\forall k : p_k \equiv \langle\psi| P_k |\psi\rangle = \langle\Psi|_{12}^f Q_2^k |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f. \quad (3)$$

(For brevity, Q_2^k stands for $(1 \otimes Q_2^k)$.)

A measurement of A is called *repeatable* if the measurement result can be confirmed by repeating the same measurement on the individual object (immediately after). Let me make this more precise.

Definition. A *measurement* of A in ρ (cf (2) and (3)) is *repeatable* if, after "reading the pointer" (by which one means an ideal measurement of the pointer observable) with the result b_k , the measured object is left in a state in which the corresponding value a_k of A is predicted with *certainty*.

Let us write the measurement in terms of so-called *state transformers* $\{A_k : \forall k\}$, linear operators satisfying $\sum_k A_k^\dagger A_k = 1$ and $\forall k : A_k^\dagger A_k = P_k$ (projector valued measure) [3], [4], [5]. (Synonyms for "state transformer" are "measurement operator", "Kraus operator" etc.) The state transformers give the change of state in measure-

*Electronic address: fedorh@infosky.net

ment:

$$|\psi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi\rangle_k^f \equiv p_k^{(-1/2)} A_k |\psi\rangle. \quad (4)$$

The state transformers are the *first Kraus representation of measurement* [6]. The measurement evolution (2) is the *second Kraus representation of measurement* [6]. It is *connected* with the first one through determining the state in which the object is left when the MI is "read":

$$\forall k: A_1^k |\psi\rangle_1 \langle\psi|_1 (A_1^k)^\dagger = \text{Tr}_2(Q_2^k |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \langle\Psi|_{12}^f Q_2^k). \quad (5)$$

Lemma 1. If the measurement of an observable A is given in terms of state transformers $\{A_k : \forall k\}$, then a *necessary and sufficient condition for repeatability* is

$$\forall k: A_k = P_k A_k. \quad (6)$$

(cf (1)).

(Since the operator relation (6) is equivalent to (6) applied to an arbitrary vector, the claim of Lemma 1 is obvious in view of Remark 1 below.)

Theorem 1. Let the final state in the measurement evolution for *repeatable* measurement be the state vector $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$ (cf (2)). It can be written in the (biorthogonal) Schmidt canonical form [7], [8] in terms of (tensor factor) state vectors:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f = \sum_k (p_k^{1/2} |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \otimes |\phi\rangle_2^k) \quad (7)$$

where p_k are the probabilities (given by (3)), $|\psi\rangle_1^{fk}$ are determined by (4) (with obvious necessary modification of the notation), and

$$\forall k: |\phi\rangle_2^k \equiv (p_k)^{-1/2} \langle\psi|_1^{fk} |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \quad (8)$$

(partial scalar product). Further,

$$\forall k: |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} = P_1^k |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\forall k: |\phi\rangle_2^k = Q_2^k |\phi\rangle_2^k. \quad (10)$$

Remark 1. The physical meaning of (9) and (10) is that the state vectors at issue predict definite values of the measured observable and of the pointer observable respectively. Namely, if $|a\rangle$ is a state vector and E an event (projector), then the general equivalence

$$\langle a | E | a \rangle = 1 \Leftrightarrow E | a \rangle = | a \rangle$$

is tantamount to

$$\langle a | E^\perp | a \rangle = 0 \Leftrightarrow E^\perp | a \rangle = 0$$

where $E^\perp \equiv 1 - E$. (The latter equivalence is obvious due to idempotency of the projector and positive definiteness of the scalar product.)

Proof of Theorem 1. One can write

$$|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f = \sum_k Q_2^k |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f. \quad (11)$$

(Note that on account of the PRC definition of measurement, $\sum_k Q_2^k$ is a certain event in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$.)

It is seen from (5) that the first-subsystem reduced density operator of $p_k^{-1/2} Q_2^k |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$ is a ray projector. Hence there cannot be correlations in the terms of (11), i.e., in view of (5) and (4), (11) can be rewritten in terms of state vectors as in (7). Relation (8) is an obvious consequence of (7), (9) follows from (6) and (4), finally, (10) is evident from (11).

Thus, expansion (7) is biorthogonal and it is in terms of state vectors and positive expansion coefficients. Therefore, it is a Schmidt canonical form as claimed. $\square$

Remark 2. Defining the subsystem states (reduced density operators)

$$\rho_s^f \equiv \text{Tr}_{s'}(|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \langle\Psi|_{12}^f) \quad s, s' = 1, 2 \quad s \neq s',$$

and evaluating them from (7), one obtains

$$\rho_1^f = \sum_k p_k |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \langle\psi|_1^{fk}, \quad (12a)$$

$$\rho_2^f = \sum_k p_k |\phi\rangle_2^k \langle\phi|_2^k. \quad (12b)$$

Comparing relations (1) and (9), and relation (10) with the spectral form of B_2 , one comes to the conclusion that the characteristic sub-bases of ρ_s^f , $s = 1, 2$, appearing in (12a) and (12b) respectively, are simultaneously also characteristic sub-bases of A_1 and B_2 respectively. Denoting the reduces in the corresponding ranges of ρ_s^f , $s = 1, 2$, by prim, one has

$$A_1' = \sum_k a_k |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \langle\psi|_1^{fk} \quad (13a)$$

and

$$B_2' = \sum_k b_k |\phi\rangle_2^k \langle\phi|_2^k. \quad (13b)$$

Thus, A_1 is complete in the range $\mathcal{R}(\rho_1^f)$ and B_2 is complete in $\mathcal{R}(\rho_2^f)$ though both may have been incomplete *a priori*.

Remark 3. Let us denote by S_m the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho_m) \equiv -\text{Tr} \rho_m \log \rho_m$, $m = 1, 2, 12$. It is well known that every bipartite pure state has equal subsystem entropies $S_1 = S_2 \equiv S$; zero total entropy S_{12} ; and its von Neumann mutual information I_{12} , which is in general defined as $S_1 + S_2 - S_{12}$, equals $2S$. It is also known that I_{12} is the sum of the amount of quasi-classical correlations equalling S and the amount of entanglement also equalling S [9], [10], [11]. In our case of $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$, one

can see from (7) that $S = H(p_k) \equiv -\sum_k p_k \log p_k$, which is the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution $\{p_k : \forall k\}$. It is also the amount of information on the observable A contained in $|\psi\rangle$.

The *physical interpretation* of the *amount of quasi-classical correlations* S ($= H(p_k)$) is, in our case, straightforward. It is, as mentioned, the amount of information that the initial state $|\psi\rangle$ contains on the measured observable A . It is also the amount of information that $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$ contains about A_1 , and the same goes for ρ_1^f . Further, it is the amount of information that ρ_2^f contains about B_2 . Besides, a bijection is established between the characteristic values of A_1 and B_2 in the Schmidt canonical form (7). This is a perfect, i. e., in the language of Shannon, a lossless and noiseless information channel. Hence, it is correct to interpret this quantity as the amount of *information* transmitted from object to MI (cf also [1]).

The *physical interpretation* of the *amount of entanglement* in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$ is not so easy. (This is not surprising because entanglement is a purely quantum concept.) Such an interpretation was given in a previous article for a general bipartite pure state [12]. But let me, first, argue the case of $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$ independently.

In QM an observable A and a state ρ can be *incompatible* $[A, \rho] \neq 0$. The physical meaning of this relation is that ρ cannot be written as a mixture of states each having a sharp value of A [13]. This, like entanglement, *has no classical counterpart*.

The *amount of incompatibility* $E_C(A, \rho)$, and it coincides with the amount of coherence of A in ρ (hence the index C), was called incompatibility (or coherence) entropy, and it was defined as *the entropy increase* of the state in ideal measurement of A in it:

$$E_C(A, \rho) \equiv S\left(\sum_k P_k \rho P_k\right) - S(\rho) \quad (14)$$

(cf relation (19) in ref. [12]). The formula of Lüders [14], [15] was used for change of state in ideal measurement.

Theorem 2. The *amount of entanglement* S in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$ equals the *amount of incompatibility or coherence* of the measured observable A_1 in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$.

Proof. Definition (14) implies $E_C(A_1, |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f) = S\left[\sum_k \left(P_1^k |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \langle\Psi|_{12}^f P_1^k\right)\right]$. Applying the mixing property [16] to the entropy of the orthogonal decomposition, one further has $E_C(A_1, |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f) = H(p_k)$ (cf Remark 3). $\square$

In theorem 2 a special case of the general claim in ref. [12] is presented. Namely, confining the composite-system state space to $\mathcal{R}(\rho_1^f) \otimes \mathcal{R}(\rho_2^f)$, the observables A_1 and B_2 are replaced by their respective reducees A'_1 and B'_2 given by (13a) and (13b) respectively. These are complete so-called twin observables (cf [12]), and, according to the general claim in this reference, any of them "carries" the amount of the entanglement in the bipartite state vector via their entropy of incompatibility with the state vector.

Every bipartite state vector has a Schmidt canonical form and an accompanying pair of complete twin observables (cf (14) and (15a,b) in ref. [12]), but they need not be physically relevant. In the case at issue, they are, because the twin observables are the two observables A_1 and B_2 , which play a basic role in measurement.

As a consequence of the PRC definition of measurement, one can say even more of the amount of entanglement in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$.

Theorem 3. The incompatibility entropy $E_C(A_1, |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f)$, i. e., the amount of entanglement in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$, equals the incompatibility entropy of the measured observable A in the initial state $|\psi\rangle$ of the object.

Proof. Direct evaluation gives

$$E_C(A, |\psi\rangle) = S\left[\sum_k (P_k |\psi\rangle \langle\psi| P_k)\right] = H(p_k).$$

Besides (14) also the mixing property of entropy [16] was made use of. $\square$

Remark 4. The spectral forms (12a) and (12b) in conjunction with (13a) and (13b) show that the measured observable A_1 is compatible with the final state of the object: $[A_1, \rho_1^f] = 0$. Obviously, A_1 is compatible also with ρ_2^f . The pointer observable B_2 is in the symmetric situation. Hence, *the incompatibility* of A_1 (or B_2) with $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \langle\Psi|_{12}^f$ is, actually, *incompatibility with the correlations* in the bipartite state.

Before "reading" the pointer, ρ_1^f is the final state of the object (in the measurement evolution). The incompatibility of A_1 and the initial state $|\psi\rangle_1 \langle\psi|_1$ has disappeared, viz., A_1 and ρ_1^f are compatible. But incompatibility *in the same amount* appears between A_1 and $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \langle\Psi|_{12}^f$ or rather between A_1 and the correlations in the latter. For a more complete understanding of what is going on with the incompatibilities, one must take into account the "reading" of the pointer.

Lemma 2. "Reading of the pointer" in the state $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$, i. e., ideal measurement of B_2 in this state, produces the tripartite final state

$$|\Phi\rangle_{123}^{ff} = \sum_k \left[p_k^{1/2} (|\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \otimes |\phi\rangle_2^k \otimes |\phi\rangle_3^k) \right] \quad (15)$$

where the third factor state vectors are eigenvectors of a second pointer observable.

Proof. On account of theorem 1, we can write $|\Phi\rangle_{123}^{ff}$ immediately in the Schmidt canonical form analogous to (7). The numerical coefficients are the same. The state transformers of ideal measurement are the characteristic projectors Q_2^k of the measured observable B_2 [3]. Hence, the counterpart of $|\psi\rangle_1^{fk}$ is evaluated from the analogues of (4) and (7) utilizing (10):

$$|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \rightarrow p_k^{(-1/2)} Q_2^k |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f = |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \otimes |\phi\rangle_2^k.$$

Thus, the claimed Schmidt canonical form (15) is obtained with state vectors $|\phi\rangle_3^k$ satisfying the analogue of (10). $\square$

Expansion (15) implies that, as far as subsystem (1+2) is concerned, the two measurements cause the following chain of changes of state:

$$|\psi\rangle_1 \otimes |\phi\rangle_2^0 \rightarrow |\Psi\rangle_{12}^f \rightarrow \rho_{12}^{ff} \equiv \sum_k \left(p_k |\psi\rangle_1^{fk} \langle\psi|_1^{fk} \otimes |\phi\rangle_2^k \langle\phi|_2^k \right).$$

Neither A_1 nor B_2 are incompatible with ρ_{12}^{ff} , i. e., the incompatibility has disappeared in the subsystem (1+2). But it reappears as the (same) amount of incompatibility of A_1 with $|\Phi\rangle_{123}^{ff}$ or rather with the correlations between subsystem 1 and subsystem (2+3).

Since $|\Phi\rangle_{123}^{ff}$ is symmetric under any permutation of the indices 1, 2, 3, one can also say that in this state B_2 is incompatible with the correlations of subsystem 2 with subsystem (1+3).

In conclusion, one can sum up the results of this note as follows: In quantum measurement of a discrete observ-

able A in a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ two quantum-information theoretic entities are of interest: One of them is the amount of information that is contained in $|\psi\rangle$ on A , and the second is the *amount of incompatibility* between A and $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Both are essentially preserved in the process of predictive measurement of A in $|\psi\rangle$. The first entity reappears as the quasi-classical part of the von Neumann mutual information I_{12} in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$, which is the final state of the interaction of object and measuring instrument. The second entity reappears as the second part of I_{12} , i. e., as the amount of entanglement in $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^f$. Thus, *the meaning of entanglement in repeatable measurement is this (preserved) amount of incompatibility*. One should keep in mind that both entanglement and incompatibility of observable and state have no classical analogues, i. e., they are purely quantum-mechanical concepts.

The result of this note is obtained under the restriction of a pure initial state of the object. It seems reasonable to *conjecture* that it can be obtained also for mixed initial states. An attempt to confirm this conjecture will be presented in a follow-up.

-
- [1] V. Vedral, e-print quant-ph/0207116 (to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.).
 - [2] P. Busch, P. J. Lahti and P. Mittelstaedt, The Quantum theory of Measurement, Lecture Notes in Physics, M2 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
 - [3] P. Busch, M. Grabowski and P. J. Lahti, Found. Phys. 25 (1995) 1239.
 - [4] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge UK, Cambridge Univ Press, 2000).
 - [5] V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74 (2002) 197.
 - [6] K. Kraus, States, Effects, and Operations (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
 - [7] A. Peres, Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods (Kluwer Ac. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993) Subsection 5.3.
 - [8] F. Herbut and M. Vujić, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) 96 (1976) 382.
 - [9] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 34 (2001) 6899 e-print quant-ph/0105028.
 - [10] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 2275; V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A 57 (1998) 1619 e-print quant-ph/9707035.
 - [11] W. H. Zurek, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) 9 (2000) 5; H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2002) 17901 e-print quant-ph/0105072.
 - [12] F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. A 66 (2002) 052321.
 - [13] F. Herbut, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) 55 (1969) 271 Appendix A, relation (A.11).
 - [14] A. Messiah, Quantum mechanics (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1961) vol. I, p. 333.
 - [15] G. Lüders, Ann. Physik 8 (1951) 322.
 - [16] A. Wehrl, Rev. Mod. Phys. 50 (1978) 221 Sections II.F. and II.B.